

Sub
By
concl.

recognition of characters appearing in at least a portion of the recorded image and transmittal of a facsimile transmission of at least a portion of the recorded image.--

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

Claims 1, 4, 8, and 9 have been amended. Claims 10-28 have been added. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 4-28 are now pending in this case.

The objection to the drawings on Form PTO-948 will be overcome when formal drawings are submitted.

Attached to this response is a proposed drawing amendment to Fig. 5. The numerical designations "14; 15" have been crossed out in order to overcome the Examiner's objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 184(f). Although these designations have been crossed out, the Examiner is respectfully requested to note that, as described at page 7, lines 1-2 of the specification, the block diagram shown in Fig. 5 represents both the camera card 15 and the camera unit 14.

As requested by the Examiner, the specification has been amended above to include appropriate section headings.

Claims 1-3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner states that because these claims include the statements "preferably a battery (3)", "preferably a semiconductor camera", and "preferably a PCMCIA card", the claims "[do] not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection

B

desired." In response to this rejection, Claims 1 and 8 have been amended above to remove these statements from these claims. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is deemed to be overcome.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 were rejected as being anticipated by Parulski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,441) under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the prior art relied on by the Examiner. More particularly, claim 1 now recites, in pertinent part:

"the device also comprises a camera unit (14) including a camera (14a), optics (14b) connected thereto, and at least one memory unit (24), wherein at least a portion of said camera unit (14) is located within a housing (1) of the device."

This amendment is supported by the specification at least at page 4, lines 24-26, and at page 7, lines 20-25.

Parulski et al. disclose at column 6, lines 53-59, a camera 20 that is connected to an extender board 24 via a flexible multi-wire cable 70. The extender board 24 plugs into a PCMCIA slot 12 of a computer 10. The cable 70 allows the camera 20 to be used at some distance from the computer 10.

Parulski et al. also disclose that the camera 20 can incorporate a structural element 22, namely an extender board 24 which couples the camera 20 to a slot 16 (see column 3, lines 47-55). Also, referring to Fig. 7 and from column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 9, it is disclosed that the camera 20 includes an RF element 72 which communicates via an RF link 76 with an RF element 74 of extender board 24, which plugs into the PCMCIA slot 12 of the computer 10.

Unlike Applicants' claim 1, the Parulski et al. patent is not seen to disclose or suggest a camera unit being located

B

within a housing of a device as set forth in claim 1. The camera 20 of Parulski et al. is connected to the computer 10 via either the cable 70, the extender board 24, or the RF link 76, and is thus located externally from the computer 10. Therefore, claim 1 is deemed to be patentable over Parulski et al. X

The Examiner will note that Schlack et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,392,447), which was cited by the Examiner but not relied on, disclose an organizer unit 10 that includes an electronic camera unit having a lens 90 (see Fig. 21) that focuses an image of a subject onto an electronic imaging device within the body of the unit 10. Image data from the camera unit is stored as a bit map image in a similar manner as data received by a scanning unit 26 taught by the reference (i.e., the bit map image is stored in a RAM unit 66) (see column 8, lines 27-32). Schlack et al. are thus not seen to disclose or suggest a camera unit comprising at least one memory unit as set forth in claim 1. }

Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice. Claim 7 is dependent upon Claim 1 and is thus also deemed to be patentable over Parulski et al. Moreover, claim 7 is deemed to be patentable over this reference for independent reasons. By example, claim 7 recites, in part, that "the device comprises an infrared link (12) for data transmission between external devices and the device." As stated above, in Parulski et al., the RF element 72 of the camera 20 communicates via the RF link 76 with the RF element 74 of extender board 24. The Parulski et al. patent is not seen to disclose or suggest an infrared link as is set forth in claim 7. Also, referring to the Applicants' patent application at page 4, lines 13-16, it can be seen that the external devices recited in Claim 7 can refer to "a printer, another microcomputer or the like." Parulski et al. are not seen to disclose or suggest that the computer 10 communicates with such devices via an xlt lines 7-9

B

infrared link. Indeed, Parulski et al. are only seen to disclose that the RF element 72 of the camera 20 communicates via an RF link 76 with an RF element 74 of extender board 24, which plugs into the PCMCIA slot 12 of the computer 10.

Claim 8 has been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter and to further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art relied on by the Examiner. Claim 8 now recites, in part, "at least a portion of a camera unit (14) is integrated in the circuit card (15), said camera unit comprising a camera (14a), and optics (14b) connected thereto, and an image processing unit (14c)." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least at page 6, lines 19-21, and in Figs. 4 and 5.

Not claimed
→

Unlike Applicants' claim 8, the Parulski et al. patent is not seen to disclose or suggest a camera unit which is integrated in a circuit card. Parulski et al. are only seen to disclose that the camera 20 either: (a) is connected to an extender board 24 via the flexible multi-wire cable 70; (b) includes the RF element 72 which communicates via the RF link 76 with the RF element 74 of extender board 24; or (c) incorporates the structural element 22, namely the extender board 24 for connecting the camera 20 into a slot 16 of the computer 10. Regarding (c), based upon a reading of Parulski et al., the reference is not seen to disclose or suggest a circuit card having a camera unit integrated therein. Indeed, referring to Parulski et al. at column 3, lines 59-63, the extender board 24 can be removable from the camera 20, or can be folded into or parallel to the camera 20 when detached from the computer. As such, it would seem that the camera 20 and the extender board 24 are separate elements or are at least non-integrated elements. Claim 8 is thus deemed to be patentable over Parulski et al.

B

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over Erving et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,426,460). Claim 9 has been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter and to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the teaching of Erving et al. As amended, claim 9 provides, in pertinent part:

"the camera unit comprises a camera, and means for processing and for storing at least a portion of the image information received by the camera unit for later recall and processing."

Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at least at from page 7, line 20 to page 8, line 2.

Erving et al. disclose a communication system which merges a voice communication with an image communication into a single transmission channel to provide a virtual voice/video communication service over a limited channel bandwidth. A voice communication path is established between two subscriber communication stations. An image recorded by a camera receiving mechanism 302 is transmitted to a receiver at the beginning of the call transmission. Portions of the image expected to be visually active during the communication are replaced at the receiver by an idealized representative image. The voice portion of the transmission is digitally encoded and transmitted from the transmitting station to the receiving station. The idealized image (i.e., lips) is animated in response to code elements of the encoded format of the digitized speech message.

Unlike Applicants' claim 9, Erving et al. are not seen to disclose or suggest a camera unit comprising means for processing and for storing at least a portion of image information received by the camera unit for later recall and processing. Instead, Erving et al. are seen to teach that an image recorded by the camera receiving mechanism 302 is merely transmitted to the receiver at the beginning

B

of a call transmission. There is no apparent disclosure or suggestion in the Erving et al. patent that the image is stored for later recall and processing. Indeed, based upon a reading of Erving et al., it would seem that if the recorded image were not transmitted at the beginning of the call transmission, but were instead stored for later recall and processing, then there would be no image provided to the receiver that would correspond to a voice communication transmitted at the beginning of the call. Therefore, claim 9 is deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner.

Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Parulski et al. in view of an article entitled "Gizmo; A Chronicle of Consumer Electronics", Popular Electronics, pp. 51-62 and 92-93, March, 1994.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to "include a cellular mobile telephone unit in the device for personal communication of Parulski et al. in order to provide a communications link to the outside world as taught by Popular Electronics." This statement is respectfully disagreed with.

The Popular Electronics article discloses a number of Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs), namely a "Newton" by Sharp Electronics Corporation, a "Zoomer" by Tandy Corporation, a "Simon" by BellSouth Cellular Corp., and an "EO 440 Personal Communicator (EO 440)" by EO, Incorporated.

According to the Popular Electronics article, the Newton can assist one to make phone calls and can send faxes. The article also states that the Newton "recognizes" the word "call" for dialing. An optional PCMCIA slot is provided in the Newton for inserting a fax/modem.

The Popular Electronics article also discloses that the

B

Zoomer has an infrared transceiver for exchanging data with a Casio B.O.S.S. electronic organizer and with other Zoomers. The Zomer also has a serial port for linking to a PC, a printer, or an optional fax/modem. A PCMCIA slot is also provided in the Zomer for adding communications applications, including a pager.

The Simon is apparently embodied as a cordless phone that can operate as a facsimile transmitter/receiver, a personal organizer, a sketch book, etc. As the Popular Electronics article states at page 54, column 2, lines 15-19, the Simon "looks like any small cellular handset", weighs 18 ounces, and has dimensions of 8 inches X 2.5 inches X 1.5 inches.

The EO 440 apparently can operate as a cellular phone if an optional cellular phone package is added to it. The device has a port for connecting a cellular communications module thereto (see page 56, columns 1-2).

Based upon a reading of the prior art relied on by the Examiner, there seems to be no suggestion that the references be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner. As the Examiner admits, Parulski et al. are not seen to disclose or suggest a device comprising a cellular mobile phone unit. Absent such suggestions, there would be no reason why one who is skilled in the art, who was faced with the same problem confronting the Applicants at the time of Applicants' invention, would consult the combination of references suggested by the Examiner.

Also, in any event it is not be clear how the devices disclosed in the Popular Electronics article would each be combined with the computer 10 of Parulski et al. in an attempt to provide Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 4 and 5. By example, based upon a reading of the Popular Electronics article, it does not seem to be clearly described how the Newton, the Zomer, and the EO 440

B

structurally comprise a cellular telephone. Thus, it is not clear how not how the computer 10 of Parulski et al. would be combined with these individual devices in the manner as suggested by the Examiner. Also by example, it is not clear how the computer 10 would need to be altered to include the Simon cordless phone having the dimensions described above.

Thus, it would not have been obvious in view of the Examiner's proposed combination of references to have attempted to provide Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 4 and 5.

Moreover, Claims 4-6 are dependent upon base claim 1 which, as argued above, is deemed to be patentable over Parulski et al. because Parulski et al. are not seen to disclose or suggest a camera unit being located within a housing of a device. Similarly, the Popular Electronics article is not seen to disclose or suggest a device having this feature. Thus, this feature would also be lacking in the Examiner's proposed combination of references. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to have attempted to provide Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 4-6 in view of the Examiner's proposed combination of references. Claims 4-6 are thus deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner.

Claims 10-28 have been added above. The Examiner will note that claim 10, which is dependent upon base claim 1, includes language that is similar to the language removed by the amendment of claim 1 above excluding the word "preferably". Claim 11, which also depends upon claim 1, includes language which is similar to that of canceled claim 2 excluding the word "preferably". Claim 12 includes language that is supported by the specification at least from page 7, line 20 to page 8, line 2. Claims 13 and 14, which are dependent upon claim 8, include language that is

B

similar to the language removed by the amendment of claim 8 above excluding the words "such as" and "preferably". Thus, no new matter has been added by these claims and such claims are deemed to be definite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 18 finds support in the specification at least at page 5, lines 26-27. Claim 19 is supported by the specification at least from page 7, line 20, to page 8, line 2. Claim 20 is supported by the specification at least at page 8, lines 10-15. Claim 21 finds support in the specification at least on page 9, lines 4-15. Claims 22 and 23 are supported at least from page 9, line 22 to page 10, line 7 of the specification. There is also support for claim 24 in the specification at least at page 11, lines 20-25. Claim 25 has support from the specification at least at page 13, lines 2-4. Claim 26 is supported by the specification at least at page 6, lines 13-14. There is also support for claim 27 at page 13, lines 19-26 of the specification. Claim 28 is a method claim which corresponds to at least portions of apparatus claims 19, 20 and 22. Because these claims have support in the specification, no new matter has been added.

In that claims 10-12 and 13-14 are dependent upon respective base claims 1 and 8, which have been shown to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner, these claims are also deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner.

Also, like claim 8, claim 15 specifies that a camera unit is integrated in a circuit card. As argued above, the prior art relied on by the Examiner is not seen to disclose such a feature. Thus, claim 15 is deemed to be patentable over this prior art. Also, claims 16 and 17, which are dependent upon claim 15, are thus also deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner.


B

Claim 18 is deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner because it is dependent upon base claim 4 which, as argued above, is deemed to be patentable.


Each of the claims 19 and 28 call for a camera unit being integrated within one of a circuit card and a housing of a notebook computer. As argued above with respect to claims 1 and 8, the prior art relied on by the Examiner is not seen to disclose these features. Thus, these claims are believed to be patentable over these references. Claims 20-27 are also believed to be patentable over these references at least because these claims are dependent from allowable base claim 19.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims as now presented are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove all of the expressed objections and rejections, and to pass this application to issue. Should any unresolved issue remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' Attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Harry F. Smith
Reg. No.: 32,493



Date

Perman & Green
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT. 06430

Telephone: (203) 259-1800
Facsimile: (203) 255-5170

B

Serial No. 08/444,224
Art Unit 2608

17

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

<u>Clair F. Mason</u>	<u>7/16/96</u>
Name of Person Making Deposit	Date

B